

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing remarks. Claims 1-86 are pending, with claims 1, 21, 41 and 59 being independent. Claims 1, 4, 21-42, 47-49, 51-53, 56, 58-60, 65-67, 69, 70, 74, and 76 have been amended, and new claims 81-86 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Examiner Interview Request

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Vu for agreeing in a telephone communication on June 8, 2006 to meet with applicant's representatives to discuss this amendment prior to issuing another Office Action. Accordingly, applicant requests that an interview be scheduled at a convenient time for the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claims 59 and 60 have been objected to for being unclear as to whether the host includes one or two set top boxes. Claim 59 has been amended to address this issue. Applicant, therefore, requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 59 and 60.

Alexander Rejection

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-37, 39-43, 45-49, 52-54, 56-61, 63-67, 70-72, and 74-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931).

This response first addresses the rejection with respect to for claim groupings: a first group of claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-17, 19, 20 and 77, then a second group of claims 21-26, 29-37, 39, 40 and 78, then a third group of claims 41-43, 45-49, 52-54, 56-58 and 79, and finally, a fourth group of claims 59-61, 63-67, 70-72, 74-76 and 80.

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-17, 19, 20 and 77

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a method for enabling user selection and perception of a television (TV) ride. A list of several different TV rides is presented. Each of

the different TV rides includes a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatically tuning a video display device to multiple different channels in sequence during a window of time. A TV ride selection from among the list of TV rides presented is received from a user to whom the list is presented, and the TV ride lineup associated with the TV ride selection is received from a host. The TV ride lineup is accessed and, in response to the received TV ride selection, a first channel that provides at least a first program included in the accessed TV ride lineup is tuned to.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least presenting a list of several different TV rides, each of the different TV rides including a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatically tuning a video display device to multiple different channels in sequence during a window of time. Moreover, Alexander does not describe or suggest tuning to a first channel that provides at least a first program included in the accessed TV ride lineup in response to the received TV ride selection.

More specifically, Alexander relates to an improvement on an electronic programming guide. [Col. 2, lines 64-65]. The electronic programming guide provides a variety of features including improved viewer interaction capabilities with the electronic programming guide, improved viewer control of video recording of future-scheduled programming, improved features to the electronic programming guide display and navigation, parental control of the electronic programming guide display, improved television program information access by the viewer, improved opportunities for the commercial advertiser to reach the viewer, improved product information access by the viewer, creation of a viewer's profile, and utilization of viewer profile information to customize various aspects of the electronic programming guide, and utilization of viewer profile information to provide customized presentation of advertising to the viewer. [Col. 5, line 56-col. 6, line 59].

In the response to arguments portion of the Office Action, the Examiner seems to equate the selection by a user of one of the various buttons "GRID", "SORT", "SCHEDULE", and "MESSAGE" in a navigation bar 20 of Alexander's EPG user interface with the recited selection by a user of a TV ride from among a presented list of several different TV rides. Selection of these buttons, however, merely results in a display of EPG data with which the user may further

manually interact to tune or schedule tuning of Alexander's television display 10. For example, selection by a user of the button "GRID" in the navigation bar 20 results in display of an EPG on-screen grid guide such as that shown in Fig. 1 of Alexander. Tuning Alexander's television display, however, requires further manual selection by the user of a program in the presented grid guide.

Accordingly, presenting a navigation bar 20 that includes the buttons "GRID", "SORT", "SCHEDULE" and "MESSAGE" is not equivalent to the recited presenting of a list of several different TV rides because the buttons in the navigation bar 20 do not include a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatically tuning a video display device to multiple different channels in sequence during a window of time. Rather, they are buttons that may be selected to request, modify, and organize the presentation of EPG data with which a user may then subsequently manually interact for tuning or scheduling the tuning of a television display for watching or recording.

Moreover, Alexander does not describe tuning to the recited first channel in response to selection of one of the buttons on the navigation bar 20. Rather, selection of the buttons results in presentation of EPG data for subsequent tuning or scheduling of tuning in response to subsequent manual interaction with the EPG, not in response to selection of the buttons of the navigation bar 20.

While Alexander does describe user creation of a "watch list", that is, a list of programs that the user desires to watch and that the TV automatically turns to the channels of programs listed on the watch list over a period of time [Col. 10, lines 1-10], the watch list is but a single specification of a single sequence of programs for automatic tuning. Accordingly, Alexander's EPG does not contemplate presenting a list of several different TV rides, each including its own TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatic tuning.

For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 21-26, 29-37, 39, 40 and 78

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claim 21 and its dependent claims.

Similarly to claim 1, claim 21 recites, among other features, a processor for presenting a list of several different TV rides, each of the different TV rides including a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatically tuning a video display device to multiple different channels in sequence during a window of time and a processor for tuning, in response to the received TV ride selection, to a first channel that provides at least a first program included in the accessed TV ride lineup. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 21, and its dependent claims, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 41-43, 45-49, 52-54, 56-58 and 79

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claim 41 and its dependent claims.

As amended, independent claim 41 recites receiving a TV ride selection from a client system, the selection being from among a list of several different TV rides presented to a user. Each of the several different TV rides includes a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatically tuning, in response to the client system receiving the TV ride selection from the user, a video display device to multiple different channels in sequence during a window of time. A first TV ride lineup is determined in response to the TV ride selection. The first TV ride lineup is transmitted to the client system. As discussed above, Alexander does not describe or suggest presenting a list of several different of the recited TV rides to a user, much less receiving a TV ride selection made from such a list. Therefore, for at least the reasons described above, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 41 and its dependent claims.

Claims 59-61, 63-67, 70-72, 74-76 and 80

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claim 59 and its dependent claims.

Similarly to claim 41, claim 59 recites, among other features, an interface for receiving a TV ride selection from a client system, the selection being from among a list of several different TV rides presented to a user. Each of the several different TV rides includes a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming for automatically tuning, in response to the client system receiving the TV ride selection from the user, a video display device to multiple different

channels in sequence during a window of time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 59, and its dependent claims, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 41.

§ 103 Rejection

Claims 6, 7, 13, 18, 27, 28, 38, 44, 50, 51, 55, 62, 68, 69 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Alexander alone, or in view of Blacketter et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0166248) or Maehiro (U.S. Patent No. 6,880, 168).

Blacketter was cited merely for displaying a viewer poll in a window, [Office Action, page 7], and Maehiro was cited merely for creating an invitation message prompting particular users to join a chat and transmitting the invitation message to particular users, [Office Action, page 8]. Therefore, neither Blacketter nor Maehiro remedy the deficiencies of Alexander discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections at least because Alexander fails to disclose or suggest the features of amended independent claims 1, 21, 41, and 59, and, assuming the references can be combined, nothing in Blacketter or Maehiro remedies these deficiencies.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$910 in payment for the Request for Continued Examination fee (\$790) and the Petition for One-Month Extension of Time fee (\$120) is being paid concurrently

Applicant : Robert M. Cooper
Serial No. : 09/867,692
Filed : May 31, 2001
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-165001 / AOLTV 14


herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization.

Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Date: _____

6/8/06

Respectfully submitted,



Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. 55,108

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331